



February 5, 1999

Theodore J. Kaczynski
04475-046
P.O. Box 8500
Florence, CO 81226-8500

Dear Ted,

Thanks for your letter of January 21. I have enclosed a counter-signed copy of the contract for your records. Rest assured that any concerns you wish to address should not pose a problem since we can address them in the form of a rider to the contract. As for timing, now that Bonnie is back on board (?), I will of course defer to whatever concerns you may have with regard to the 2255.

As far as the Waits-product (bad pun on waste product), I was glad to be of some service to you. I too noticed some of the inconsistencies you mention, (e.g., the enclosed talking points I prepared for Mello's call to you,— per Bonnie's wise decree vis-à-vis the potential "muddying of the representational waters" (Mello's phrase) he will not be using them). The only additional information I have regarding this Waits business comes by way of Ulveman, who got it from Mary Spurlin. Apparently, Waits told the FBI that he didn't know you when they asked the *first* time around. Also: get in touch with Mello. He has spoken to Waits, but has not related to me the substance of his conversation.

I saw an iota of your 14-page letter to the Montana papers. Not good. I suggested that you resist that particular temptation, since it seemed fairly likely that the publisher would turn it around to up sales on the book. That's just what happened. I hope that you might consider letting me help you with these interactions with the press. I do know how to keep them on a short leash. I am not saying that I can control how they spin the story. But I'd like to think I can affect that spin.

P. 5, ¶ 2 (re. suggestions): Sallinger should not get the story. Jensen and Ulveman could do a great job; and I can say for certain that Ulveman is convinced that Waits is a liar. To put it in perspective, you'd be better off letting 60 Minutes do an exposé without *any* control over the treatment.

Here's my take on Waits: . (He really doesn't even warrant the space I've granted between colon and full-stop, although he does belong *in* a colon.) To be serious, I know the type. He's a pathological liar; reminds me of my step-sister. I trust my intuition on this score. Here's my

question: If you two were such bosom buddies, what's with the dedication? It seems hardly likely to me that you could stand talking to someone who raped the woods for a living. Here's another problem: The interaction between him and you, *even as he reports it*, could *only* be described as a nodding acquaintance, and that includes the car rides which you have denied, with the exception mentioned in your letter. I would like to know the truth regarding the cabin (did he build it, where did he find the bit of veneer with your handwriting on it? is it your handwriting? what about the other stuff?). The winter photo versus the spring photo proves that Waits made some "improvements", the latter has plywood covering the roof.

It is not clear to me whether copies or people are being sold at Town and Country. I assume it's a little of both. I understand why you want to redress the matter. I just wonder if the time is right. I have written an email letter to Bonnie regarding the discussion with 60 Minutes (enclosed). I can only imagine that you would rather talk about something else, but this will take little time. Doing something with them will take a lot of time. They seem to be very willing to work out an acceptable situation. That's it. I imagine this would have to wait until after you have filed the petition. Bonnie thinks it wouldn't be practical until autumn. (There's more, but it's covered in my letter to Bonnie.)

I think a program on public television should be done eventually. Has this been discussed at all with Fischler? I would be more than interested to help him out in any way you like. I bet he'd do a fair and balanced piece. He made a film on Emma Goldman, I know that much. Not much more. But I liked his tone in the letter you sent to me. He's probably okay. Protecting his own interest perhaps, but okay: The Oxford Concise says that okay is "probably" derived from *orl/oll korrekt*, jocular form of "all correct." I've heard mention that its origin is African (not "ebonic") and that it came over with the slaves, who after all had to say okay quite a bit. I guess that came to mind with regard to this media stuff. While looking for the article about your letter in the Missoulain archive, I found an article in which Judy Clarke supposedly said that if you talk to the media, "they will steal your soul." I know what she means. To say "okay" to the media is to put yourself in a subordinate position, and more often than not it is to place yourself in thrall to propaganda. One is put to work, transformed into an element of *status quo* technique.

But I think you might be able to choose the terms to a fair degree — because these folks are like employers. The sort of thralldom or slavery I am limning here is synonymous with the phenomena of the workaday world. The more qualified you are, the better working conditions, salary, etc. You are very "qualified;" the media *want* to hear your side. You can determine the manner in which they will do so because you determine whether or not you will do the thing they desire. Okay, I am tired.

I wanted to thank you for the comments and corrections to Mello's manuscript. I think you will be pleased with the final copy. As it turns out, I went after a lot of the same things.

I hope that you are well.

Yours,

Beau.

Subject: Re: 60 Min.

Date: Fri, 05 Feb 1999 13:58:28 -0500

From: Context Media <simnyc@interport.net>

To: Richard Bonnie <rbonnie@law1.law.virginia.edu>

> As far as I'm concerned, Ted has given a nearly definitive "no" to the
> 60 Minutes idea. Do you have any different info from him?

In a Dec 14 letter, Ted wrote: "[60 Minutes] would have to agree in writing, with all the necessary legal formalities, that their program on my case would be reviewed before being broadcast, by me and Professor Bonnie, and if the program actually broadcast differed in the slightest detail from what had been approved by me and Professor Bonnie, then CBS would be bound to pay some colossal financial indemnity -- say a billion dollars -- or anyway enough to guarantee that they would not even consider breaking the agreement..."

On December 20 he wrote: "I've softened on the 60 Minutes issue. Bonnie has asked me to at least consider giving them an interview, so I'm willing to consider it."

This is when we decided to give the matter a rest, and I asked Mello to cease and desist. After your meeting with Ted, I asked if you had proposed a three-question limit to Ted, so we could see what sort of thing 60 Minutes had in mind. You had not asked, so I wrote to him on the 11th to ask. Since then there has been nothing but talk of Waits. Ted has not responded to the query. You will recall that I did say we would resume talks with 60 Minutes after the 1 month hiatus, which ended at the first of this month. Vicki called me on the 31st to set up a meeting.

I think I understand Ted's worries well, and I have a good idea of what would need to happen for him to agree. I have told Gordon that you would want complete control. She is willing to try and come up with a proposal. So far, she has suggested the following: 60M will provide you and Ted with a COMPLETE transcript of all tape shot during the interview. You would then edit it. They would then indicate what sort of visuals they will use along with other interviews. They would be willing to limit the people interviewed to a list provided by Ted. If he wanted Mello, his etc they would

accommodate him, (i.e., provided the people he has indicated are willing to comply). I do not think we have discussed much of anything yet, and Ted is one who likes to know all the facts before making a decision. I imagine that Waits has so thoroughly occupied Ted's non-2255 time, that he has not earnestly considered the matter. And it would be much better for him to talk nationally than with Sallinger, who also wants an interview (Ted has either been leading him on by suggesting this is possible (probably the case) or he is seriously considering it). My impression is that 60 Minutes is willing to do an honest story, Vicki was pretty worked up when I questioned her about it (i.e., worked up with righteous indignation when I suggested that they might turn the tables against Ted). At this point, I am not terribly willing to enter this labyrinth, I simply want to make sure the conversation has been inclusive and intelligent. If Ted has made a decision, I will close the matter. He has already begged off p/r, and feels it is better to ~~relate~~ communicate with his adherents, which I respect. I feel differently about the matter, from intellectual, ideological AND financial points of view. But thus far we have neglected the conversations necessary to drawing an informed decision. *Concluding*

Bonnie's pt. :

- You might consider asking to be interviewed by someone else: ie: Leslie Stahl.

I will send a copy of this email to Ted, but you may want to discuss this matter with him directly, since there is a three week lag period when I correspond with him...

I'll be in the office until 6.30, hope to talk to you soon and also that this note finds you well!

Beau